Debate on Looting Part 1

Debate on Looting

I made a series of charges against Muhammad and challenged any Muslim to disprove me, promising that should anyone prove me wrong, I will remove that charge and if all the charges are proven wrong I will remove the entire site. Here is my challenge

Mr. Bassam Zawadi on answering-christianity.com has written some rebuttals of those charges and has challenged me to keep my word and remove the site. I am going to respond to all his refutations one by one and will show that he, not only did not refute those charges, he actually confirmed them. In this part I will respond to his rebuttal of my claim that Muhammad was a looter.

You can read my charge that **Muhammad was a thief and a looter** here.

Mr. Bassam Zawadi did not exactly respond to me himself but instead he created a collage of what various Muslim apologists have written on the subject of looting to, supposedly, prove that looting in Islam is prohibited. However as you will see, these scholars, not only have admitted that Islam approves of looting, they are also defensive of it. I am going to quote Mr. Zawadi's response paragraph by paragraph and respond to them. You can read his response from his own site too. http://www.answering-christianity.com/bassam_zawadi/rebuttaltoalisina7.htm

Mr. Zawadi wrote:

> When armies go at war, one side wins and the other loses obviously. The side that loses not only lose the battle but also lose their possessions. Their houses, armor, food, wealth etc. Now I am going to be showing what the Muslims did with the spoils of war. They did not loot it like how Ali Sina makes it to look like. The Muslims took it legally (because it was during time of war) and they used it legally. I am going to be presenting Islam's perspective and rules regarding this issue.

If Mr. Zawadi had not mentioned my name in his site, I would have thought that he must have been one of the jihadis who fought in the army of Umar and not someone living in the 21st century. In this day and age when two armies go to war the winner is not allowed to loot or take possession of the houses, food and wealth of the conquered.

In 1949 an International Convention was held in Geneva and protection was granted to the victims of war. This convention prohibits violence to life and person, in particular murder of all kinds, mutilation, cruel treatment and torture and taking of hostages of the defeated party.

It enjoined that the wounded and sick shall be collected and cared for. Those who violate these provisions are treated as war criminals and eventually are brought to justice.

In accordance to this convention Muhammad was a war criminal. He took as hostage his prisoners of war and demanded ransom or threatened to kill them. He mutilated, tortured and murdered his prisoners of war. As a matter of fact “war” is a misnomer. Muhammad’s "wars" were raids (*qazwah*). His victims were not forewarned. Often there was no hostility between them and Muslims and they were unsuspecting and not prepared for the attack. They were raided with no prior notice and as such they were killed as unarmed civilians and not as combatants in battlefields.

Muslims might say the Geneva Convention was singed in the last century. How Muhammad can be found guilty of violating laws that did not exist at his time? The answer is that although these laws are newly written, they are based on ancient ethics. Dealing with the prisoners of war justly, has nothing to do with laws. This is a matter of conscience and fairness. Can we say Attila the Hun, Genghis Khan or even Hitler were innocent because when they were doing their massacres and atrocities, the Geneva Convention did not exist? The law is new, but the morality of it is as old as mankind.

The question that we have to ask ourselves is whether what Muhammad did was ethically right? It certainly was not. Did Muhammad like to be treated the way he treated others? Of course not! When a group of Bedouins stole some of his “stolen camels” and killed the shepherd, Muhammad found them, cut their extremities and left them in the sun to die a painful slow death. If stealing was so bad that deserved such harsh and inhumane punishment, why he would engage in that activity? Why he would raid unarmed people, kill them and loot their belongings?

The Pagans were not as bad as Muslims. They were much more civilized and humane.

When Nadr ibn Harith, Muhammad’s own cousin who in Mecca had derided him was captured in the battle of Badr, he besought Musab, the person who was carrying him handcuffed to Muhammad to intercede for him. Musab reminded him that he had denied faith and insulted the Prophet. “Ah” said Nadr, “had the Quraish made you a prisoner, they would never have put you to death!” “Even where it so”, Musab scornfully replied, “I am not as you are; **Islam has rent all bonds asunder**”. “*Idrab anqihu*” (strike his neck) shouted Muhammad with blood in his eyes upon seeing Nadr and the poor man was beheaded at once. His corpse was thrown in the well along with other victims.

Another prisoner in that battle was Oqba. When he was brought for execution, he ventured to expostulate, and demand why he should be treated more vigorously than the other captives. "Because of your enmity to God and to his Prophet," replied Muhammad. *"And my little girl!*" cried Oqba, in the bitterness of his soul, "*who will take care of her*? " - "**Hell-fire**!" exclaimed the heartless conqueror; and on the instant his victim was hewn to the ground and blood gushed from his slit gullet. Then Muhammad praised his Allah “**I give**

thanks unto Allah that hath slain thee, and comforted mine eyes thereby." [*Waqidi*, p108]

These are the traits of a narcissist psychopath. He could not forgive those who insulted him and had hurt his gigantic ego. He took immense pleasure, taking revenge of those who had humiliated him.

The reason the non-Muslims lost was because they were inhibited by their humanness and were unwilling to use brutal force against the Muslims to subdue them. They believed in freedom of belief and “multiculturalism”. They had no clue how evil and demonic Islam is and because of this underestimation, they lost. This is the very weakness of the non-Muslims today. If Muslims are not stopped with anything it takes, they will win and the non-Muslims will be slaughtered with the same brutality that Nadr and Oqba, or the more recent victims of Islam such as Daniel Pearls and Margaret Hasan were slaughtered.

It is foolish to believe you can overcome evil will kindness. It is foolish to believe that the followers of a ruthless man such as Muhammad will deal with you justly when they come to power. This mistake was committed by many Iranians who stayed in Iran, such as the minorities and those who had prominent positions during the regime of the Shah, after the Islamic revolution because they thought they had done nothing wrong to fear. They paid this error of judgment with their lives. Evil must be crushed with force. How much force?... As much as it takes! There is no price high enough to preserve our freedom and our lives. Kindness must be shown to those who denounce evil. But those who support it must be dealt with our wrath.

For the sake of argument, let us say that people in those days were savages. At least this is the lie that Muslims want us to believe. Is this a good excuse for Muhammad to raid, rape, loot, and massacre people with savagery? Did Muhammad come to guide people to the right path or was he a victim of the bad traditions of his people? Didn’t he call the pagans ignorant? If so, why did he follow their ways? The man who taught his followers with how many stones they should wipe their rears after the call of nature did not know looting and stealing is evil and he should not set that kind of examples. Are we supposed to believe that he was a prophet?

Muslims have very circular reasoning. They claim that Muhammad came to guide the ignorant people to the right path. But when we point out the evils committed by this man, they say he was a man of his time and did what others were doing. We are not talking about the way he dressed. This is raiding, raping, looting and killing innocent people we are talking about?

Let us not words deceive us. The "right path" for Muslims has totally a different meaning. This term for them means following the mandates of Muhammad and acting like him. It is not the same right path and right deeds most of us are familiar with. In fact most Islamic "right paths" are very demonic - like killing the unbelievers and looting their properties. In Islam this is the right path because Muhammad did it and asked his followers to do it.

Although the claim that pagans were worse than Muslims is a lie, it still does not justify Muhammad's crimes. This man claimed to be the prophet of God, "**the best example to follow**", an "**honorable person**" and "**the best of creation**". In a Hadith Qudsi he makes his Allah say to him: **“Were it not for you, I would not have created the universe.”** Imagine the level of insanity! How could such a person with such outlandish claims act like the worst criminal? If anyone else does what Muhammad did, wouldn’t you say that this person is a criminal? Then why a messenger of God, the person who thinks the universe is created for him, should act like a criminal?

Let us delve into the sick mind of this psychopath narcissist and see what else he said about himself:

- “The very first thing that Allah Almighty ever created was my soul.”
- “First of all things, the Lord created my mind.”
- “I am from Allah, and the believers are from me.” source

Yet this man, with such megalomaniac reveries of grandiosity, in real life acted like a despicable criminal. Hey people! Where is your brain? How much you have to fool yourself and why?